



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

11.7

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,299	07/31/2003	Kazuyoshi Kishibata	35985	3684

116 7590 03/05/2007

PEARNE & GORDON LLP
1801 EAST 9TH STREET
SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108

EXAMINER

PARRIES, DRU M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2836

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/632,299	KISHIBATA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dru M. Parries	2836	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 3-8 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed October 4, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the added limitation to claims 1 and 2, the Examiner believes that this limitation is inherent in systems such as the one claimed, and in the Prior Art/Walter/Rashid invention. The claimed "set rotational speed" is equivalent to the minimum speed necessary for the first generation coil to be able to generate enough output power to drive the electrical load. Therefore, in the Prior Art/Walter/Rashid invention, the minimum speed of the internal combustion engine (ICE) necessary to allow the first generation coil to generate an output necessary for driving said electrical load is considered the set rotational speed. The turns of the coil is irrelevant; the variable rotational speed of the ICE compensates for whatever number of turns there are in the generation coil. Therefore, the set number of turns are whatever the number of turns happen to be in any given invention.
2. The Examiner doesn't understand the Applicant's argument (nor the relevance) regarding the statement that based on the newly added amendment, the first generation coil is miniaturized (reduced) and that the two-generation coils can't be identical. The Examiner believes these arguments are moot, since these limitations were not positively recited in the claims.
3. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case, Prior Art teaches a first power supply system supplying DC power. Walter teaches assisting the first power supply

Art Unit: 2836

system via the second power supply system when the output of the first power supply system is insufficient.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art (Admission) and Walter (6,608,401). Admission teaches two power supply systems, each using a generation coil from two different generators driven by internal combustion engines. The first system supplying DC power to loads provided in a vehicle and the second system supplying AC power to external loads (Fig. 4). Admission fails to teach a power supply circuit for assisting the first power supply system via the second supply system. Walter teaches two power supply systems (12 and 14). He also teaches a supply circuit via the second supply system for supplying an output having the same voltage value as the rated value of an output voltage of the first supply system to assist said first supply system (Col. 4, lines 54-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the supply circuit into Admission so that if the first generation coil's output power were to decrease or become non-existent, the second supply system could pick up the slack for it. It is also inherent that the first generation coil has a set number of turns (whatever number it has), and able to generate an output necessary for driving the electrical load when the internal combustion engine (ICE), which drives the coil, exceeds a rotational speed necessary (a.k.a. the set rotational speed) for the

Art Unit: 2836

coil to output a necessary power, and if the rotational speed of the ICE falls below the set rotational speed necessary, then the first generation coil cannot generate the output necessary for driving the electrical load.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art (Admission), Walter (6,608,401), and Rashid (5,077,485). Admission teaches two power supply systems, each using a generation coil from generators driven by internal combustion engines. The first system supplying DC power to loads provided in a vehicle and the second system supplying AC power to external loads (Fig. 4). Admission fails to teach a power supply circuit for assisting the first power supply system via the second supply system, and the generation coils being from the same generator. Walter teaches two power supply systems (12 and 14). He also teaches a supply circuit via the second supply system for supplying a DC output having the same voltage value as the rated value of an output voltage of the first supply system to assist said first supply system (Col. 4, lines 54-65). Rashid teaches one generator (34) with two different generation coils (40 and 46), each as their own power supply system to supply to loads (Fig. 3; Col. 5, lines 16-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Walter's circuit into Admission so that if the first generation coil's output power were to decrease or become non-existent, the second supply system could pick up the slack for it. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have both generation coils coming from the same generator because it will save on space and cost, only needing one generator instead of two. It is also inherent that the first generation coil has a set number of turns (whatever number it has), and able to generate an output necessary for driving the electrical load when the internal combustion engine (ICE), which drives the coil, exceeds a rotational speed necessary (a.k.a. the set rotational speed) for the

Art Unit: 2836

coil to output a necessary power, and if the rotational speed of the ICE falls below the set rotational speed necessary, then the first generation coil cannot generate the output necessary for driving the electrical load.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 3-8 are allowed. No prior art of record teaches a transfer switch that switches a second power supplies output from external loads of a vehicle to a supply line that provides power to electrical loads in a vehicle.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dru M. Parries whose telephone number is (571) 272-8542. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday from 9:00am to 6:00pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached on 571-272-2800 x 36. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DMP

2-27-2007


CHAU N. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER